

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

**2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT**

**FOR:**

**Orion's Mind**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Satisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Meeting Standard (3)	Criminal Background Checks	In Compliance
Recruiting Materials	Unsatisfactory	Instruction is clear	Meeting Standard (3)	Health/safety laws & regulations	In Compliance
Academic Program	Satisfactory	Time on task is appropriate	Meeting Standard (3)	Financial viability	In Compliance
Progress Reporting	Unsatisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Meeting Standard (3)		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	Unsatisfactory	Student/instructor ratio: 6:1, 7:1, 7:1	Meeting Standard (3)		

**ACTION NEEDED:**

**Due to violations of the Indiana Department of Education's incentives policy, Orion's Mind is placed on probation for the 2008-2009 school year due to violations of the Indiana Department of Education's incentives policy. As such, Orion's Mind has been required to implement corrective actions to address all areas of concern related to incentives.**

In addition to corrective action required for probation as a result of violations of IDOE's incentives policy, for 2008-2009, Orion's Mind will be required to take the following actions:

The revised progress report submitted in July 2008 is still missing two components from the progress reporting checklist: student goals from the SES agreement/student learning plan and a written statement that recommendations regarding how the progress report can be improved can be made by calling or

emailing the provider (supply phone number and/or email address). In 2008-2009, Orion's Mind will be required to submit copies of revised progress reports to IDOE upon request. Requests must be fulfilled within the timeframe given at the time the request is made. Progress reports must include all components of the IDOE progress reporting checklist. Progress reports must also be filled out consistently from tutor to tutor and site to site.

As per the June 2, 2008 letter from Orion's Mind, adjustments will be made to assessments to ensure that only Indiana academic standards are reflected. In 2008-2009 Orion's Mind will be required to submit copies of pre-assessment diagnostic reports and individual learning plans to IDOE upon request. Requests must be fulfilled within the timeframe given at the time the request is made. Documents must reflect only Indiana academic standards.

While revised program descriptions addressed concerns related to program location and tutor qualifications, it will be necessary for Orion's Mind to further revise program descriptions for 2008-2009 to be in compliance with revised Indiana Department of Education Policies and Procedures for SES for 2008-2009. Specifically, revised program descriptions refer to student/instructor ratios of 8:1. Revised 2008-2009 IDOE Policies & Procedures Subpart B, Section 2.4(d) indicate that the ratio for large group instruction may not exceed 6:1. Flyers for 2008-2009 should reflect this change.

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Orion's Mind  
**REVIEWER:** MC

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** 4/9/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<p><b>BOTH</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Tutor resumes/applications (<u>all tutors</u>)</li> <li>-Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)</li> </ul> <p><i>In addition to:</i></p> <p><b>ONE</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Tutor evaluations (<u>all tutors</u>)</li> <li>-Recruiting policy for tutors (<u>one copy</u>)</li> <li>-Sample tutor contract (<u>one copy</u>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tutor resumes</li> <li>• Tutor applications</li> <li>• Tutor sign-in sheet</li> <li>• Tutor training materials</li> <li>• Instructor expectations</li> <li>• Tutor description</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per Orion's Mind's originally approved application, tutors must at a minimum meet paraprofessional requirements; however, more experience is preferable. Resumes submitted for tutors observed indicate that they are licensed teachers with extensive classroom teaching experience.</li> <li>• Lead tutor has a post-secondary degree and has completed professional development and training on classroom management, curriculum delivery, and program operation. Lead tutor has a degree in organizational leadership.</li> <li>• As per Orion's Mind's application, all tutors must participate in Orion's Mind training prior to beginning to tutor. As per the instructor expectations, tutors are expected to participate in the initial training, as well as ongoing training and meetings.</li> <li>• Tutor training materials cover organizational structure, tutor responsibilities, team meetings, tutor observations, behavior and classroom management guidelines, curriculum (although curriculum refers to Illinois standards—see below), activities, incentives, attendance, individual learning</li> </ul>

					<p>plans, and assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Originally submitted tutor training alludes to 40 hours of tutoring. However, the contract with School City of East Chicago indicates that 30 hours of tutoring are provided. Additionally, originally submitted training program for Indiana tutors referenced Illinois standards and not Indiana standards. Revised tutoring training materials were submitted.</li> </ul>
Recruiting materials	<p><b>TWO</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Advertising or recruitment fliers</li> <li>-Incentives policy</li> <li>-Program description for parents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incentives flyer</li> <li>Recruitment flyer for tutors</li> <li>Program descriptions (for Illinois?)</li> </ul>	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incentives given were not in compliance with IDOE's incentives policy.</li> <li>Originally submitted program description for parents indicates that 40 hours of tutoring is offered. However, the contract with School City of East Chicago indicates that 30 hours of tutoring is offered. The flyer also states that tutoring will be provided at the child's school; however, in East Chicago, tutoring was being provided at the library, not at the child's school. Program descriptions and flyers must EXACTLY match programming, tutor qualifications, and number of hours offered. Revised program description was submitted.</li> <li>Originally submitted flyer indicates that instructors are "highly qualified." However, as per Orion's Mind's application and tutor descriptions, while teacher licensure is preferred, it is not a requirement of being employed as a tutor by Orion's Mind. The term "highly qualified" has a specific connotation under No Child Left Behind of being a certified teacher, having at least a Bachelor's degree, AND having subject area certification or having demonstrated subject area knowledge through a test, by having a degree in that subject, or by meeting 100 points on a state-approved uniform standard of alternative qualification assessment (HOUSSE). Revised program description was</li> </ul>

					<p>submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Originally submitted program description (titled “Who is Orion’s Mind”) indicates that curriculum is aligned with Illinois Academic Standards. Because Orion’s Mind is operating in Indiana, program descriptions sent to Indiana parents must reflect that Orion’s Mind curriculum is aligned with INDIANA academic standards, not Illinois. Revised program description was submitted.</li> </ul>
Academic Program	<p><b>ONE</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors</li> </ul> <p><i>In addition to:</i></p> <p><b>ONE</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects)</li> <li>-Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lesson plans</li> <li>Connection to Indiana standards</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lesson plans reflect the Orion’s Mind curriculum described in the original application and are divided into mixed age/grade level groups as observed in the lessons.</li> <li>Specific connections to Indiana academic standards are made for Math and Reading in each lesson plan.</li> <li>Lesson plans are connected to both activities and to the curriculum in the workbooks. Students participate in a variety of activities during the lessons.</li> </ul>
Progress Reporting	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports)</li> <li>-Timeline for sending progress reports</li> <li>-Documentation of reports sent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>Documentation of reports sent</li> <li>Timeline for progress reports</li> <li>SES contract with School City of East Chicago</li> <li>SES agreements</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress report includes a list of goals (the same list is provided on each progress report) that tutors can select from for students to work on. However, it is unclear how progress toward achieving goals is measured. In other words, how will the tutor know if the student reads with understanding and fluency? While the assessment (Scantron) is referred to on the second page, it is unclear how the Scantron results directly relate to the goals. The progress report describes the Scantron but doesn’t actually provide information to parents/districts about what student scores on the Scantron are and does not provide specific information about progress on specific content “assessment throughout the program.” Goals should be phrased so that they are measurable and include measures to be used to determine progress toward goal</li> </ul>

					<p>attainment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although progress report lists skills that the student has mastered, it is not completely clear how these skills relate to the goals listed above them. It may be helpful to clearly connect mastery of the skills with goals to be attained. For example, it would be helpful to clearly delineate which skills would be connected to the goal of “read and understand literature representative of various societies, eras, and ideas.”</li> <li>• Some students have all goals listed at the top selected. This may not be feasible goal selection for 30 hours of tutoring.</li> <li>• Progress reports do not include all required information listed on the IDOE Progress Reporting Checklist. As per the checklist, progress reports must also include pre- and post-assessment (as applicable) scores and a written statement that recommendations about how the progress report can be improved can be made by calling or e-mailing (and then give contact information).</li> <li>• On some progress reports, skills selected as needing to be developed, as well as comments made by tutors, do not connect with the goals listed at the top. For example, on one of the progress reports, the student goal is listed as “listen and speak effectively in a variety of situations.” However, it appears that the student has mastered “listening comprehension” and only needs to develop math skills (in addition, as per the tutor comment, the student needs to “work on actual reading and fluency.”) If that is the case, it is unclear then why “read with understanding and fluency” was not selected as a goal instead of “listen and speak effectively”. If student goal is to “listen and speak effectively”, it is unclear why no comments or</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>checkmarks were made indicating what skills student should develop to attain that goal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports were not consistently completed. While some progress reports had specific skills circled that students need to develop, other progress reports had generic statements..</li> <li>• The progress reports filled out by one tutor are nearly identical for each student in that they have the same mastered skills circled and the same goals selected. Based on the formatting of the progress report (as noted above), it is unclear how students demonstrated that they had mastered these skills and why all goals were selected for them, even though the only deficit listed was “need to work more on math concepts.”</li> <li>• Goals checked on progress reports are not always the same as concepts listed to be covered on the individual learning plan.</li> <li>• A revised progress report was submitted; however, it was still missing two required components (see “Action Needed”).</li> <li>• In the SES agreements, #4 and #5 on page 3 were not filled out. These sections should be filled out for each student and should list measurable goals that students should attain through tutoring and steps that will be taken to meet these goals.</li> </ul>
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student</li> <li>- Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out)</li> <li>-Explanation and evidence regarding how provider’s pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of process for developing individual learning plans</li> <li>• Pre-assessment scores and individual learning plans</li> <li>• Explanation of correlation between assessment and</li> </ul>	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual learning plans include pre-assessment scores and list skills/concepts that the student is to cover.</li> <li>• Individual learning plans list concepts that have been identified as weaknesses on the pre-assessment.</li> <li>• Scantron assessment is utilized as the pre-assessment, which correlates with Orion’s Mind’s amended application.</li> <li>• Scantron allows for state selection and then tags questions that are aligned with Indiana academic standards.</li> <li>• For each student, Scantron identifies areas</li> </ul>

		<p>Indiana standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-assessment results diagnostic pages</li> </ul>		<p>of strength and weakness and specifically identifies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For several students, reading standards listed on the “Standards Performance” section of the Scantron diagnostic pre-assessment are Illinois academic standards, not Indiana academic standards. As Indiana students, students should be tested using the Indiana setting. It is inappropriate to identify Illinois standards for students. In addition, while the math pre-assessments do identify some standards for grades K-2 (which is what the red-green math assessment is supposed to be assessing and is designed for, according to the tutor training), other standards listed are Illinois standards that are not K-2 standards for Indiana. Indiana students should not be tested on Illinois academic standards. Results of the Scantron diagnostic pre-assessment for each student must not reflect Illinois academic standards and must only reflect Indiana academic standards.</li> <li>• Although individual learning plans list concepts to be covered, learning plans should also specifically list student goals (written in a what, how much, and by when format) as opposed to only listing concepts to cover. Learning plans will be revised for 2008-2009.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---



## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Orion's Mind

**SITE:** Heritage Hall, 4506 Tod. Ave., East Chicago, IN

**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** A.D., E.G., V.G.

**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 3

**DATE:** 3/29/08

**REVIEWERS:** M.C., S.T.

**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 9:05A.M.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application			X		<p>Students were in groups by grade level skills (based on pre-assessment placement). The 5<sup>th</sup> &amp; 6<sup>th</sup> grade group were working on a project-based activity, a baggage claim project. Students were required to use geometry (angles and measurements, as well as physics to look at speed of movement based on the angle) to figure out how to get baggage moved from one location to another. The tutor had cardboard tubes and rubber balls to represent the luggage. Tape was placed on the floor to represent the plane and the baggage claim. In the K/1 room, students were practicing storytelling using picture cards. Students were supposed to use adjectives that they had previously discussed. Students worked together in small groups retelling the story of the ugly duckling using the picture cards. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> &amp; 4<sup>th</sup> grade group, students were playing a rhyme game at first as a warm-up activity. Then the tutor wrote a word on the whiteboard and students threw a ball to one another. The student who caught the ball had to come up with a word that rhymed with the word on the board. After finishing the activity, students were going to work on the lesson using their workbooks.</p> <p>Orion's Mind's application indicates that programming will include constructivist techniques, focus on multiple intelligences, offer differentiated instruction, and provide engaged and experiential learning in small group environments. The lessons observed included experiential activities, interpersonal and cooperative activities, visual, auditory, and kinesthetic activities, and engagement with activities through cooperative learning. Lessons observed match the description in the original application. Additionally, observed curriculum (organized into pods) matches the description in the provider's approved application, as do grade level groupings.</p>

Instruction is clear			X		Instructors were clearly utilizing lesson plans that included instructions for them related to activities to complete both utilizing the workbooks and participating in hands-on activities such as the baggage claim project or the storytelling activity. Lessons observed also appeared to build on previous lessons, which further made lesson purposes clearer to students. There appeared to have been clear routines established in the classrooms. For example, in the K/1 classroom, each student had been assigned a job (e.g., snacks, cleanup crew, timer, etc.) which minimized transitions. Although students appeared to have a clear understanding of the lessons, sometimes tutors might have utilized additional techniques to ensure full student comprehension. For example, in the baggage claim activity, at times the project was strongly teacher-directed and not as collaborative-learning based. However, in general the students understood why they were participating in the activity and what academic concepts were being covered. In addition, in the rhyme game, in some cases (when students couldn't think of a rhyming word), the tutor told them what word to say. Instead, it might have been beneficial for the tutor to use visual or vocabulary hints to help students come up with their own words (thus practicing vocabulary and the vowel "u" at the same time). In general, however, tutors utilized a variety of techniques to ensure that students understood the objectives of lessons and the purpose of activities.
Time on task is appropriate			X		Tutoring began right on time at 9AM. Students seemed to enjoy the activities and seemed excited to participate in them. As noted, due to previously existing routines that had been established, transition times were minimized and students remained on task during transition times. In the K/1 group, when students were working in small groups, the tutor rotated between the groups. When a group of students got off task, the tutor moved to that group and helped get focused back on the activity. Although it was sometimes difficult to ensure that students were on task at all times (due to the size of the group), the tutor utilized a variety of techniques to help students remain focused. In the other groups, students participated fully in the activities.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable			X		Instructors were knowledgeable of lesson plans and the curriculum that students in each group were supposed to be working on. It was also clear that, despite the fact that all tutors used a variety of materials in their lessons, the tutors had prepared beforehand because there was not a lag between setting up the activities and beginning the activities. Instructors used a variety of motivational techniques to encourage students, which helped students participate. Instructors also generally utilized age-level appropriate instructional techniques with students. The tutors did well ensuring that all students were participating; for example, in the K/1 group when students were working in small groups, the tutor tried to rotate between the small groups. Note the comments in the "instruction is clear" section for additional techniques that perhaps could have been used in lessons.
Student/instructor ratio: 7:1, 7:1, 5:1 Ratio matches that reported in original provider application			X		Ratios observed are within the 6-8:1 ratio in the amended application.

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric COMPLIANCE Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Orion's Mind  
**REVIEWER:** MC

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** 4/9/08

The following information is rated "Compliance" (C) or "Non-Compliance" (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criminal background checks for all tutors</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>	
Health and safety laws and regulations	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Student release policy(ies)  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tutor handbook</li> <li>Student release policy (revised)</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>	
Financial viability	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of liability insurance</li> <li>Tax returns for two years</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>	